

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Application as examined included claims 1-20. Claims 21-186 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4, 10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18 are currently amended. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 5-9, 11, 14, 17 and 19-20 are unchanged.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bandini et al (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0199095).

Bandini et al describes an e-mail relay, providing message filtering services to an e-mail network by comparing attributes of incoming messages to data derived from SPAM messages, which is stored in a SPAM database.

Applicants express appreciation to Examiner Christian La Forgia for the courtesy of an interview granted to applicants' representative, Sanford T. Colb, Reg. No. 26,856. The interview was held in the USPTO on June 5, 2007. The substance of the interview is summarized in the Interview Summary.

At the interview, claim 1 was discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of record of Bandini et al. The Interview Summary states, in relevant part, "The representative for Applicant submitted a proposed claim that incorporated the use of a template to distinguish SPAM messages. Support for this can be found on page 17, lines 14-26 of the specification. This distinction appears to overcome the prior art of record. Upon the filing of a formal response, the Examiner will further consider the Bandini reference and conduct an updated search."

Applicants have accordingly amended claim 1, as proposed at the interview, to include the recitation of "using at least one stored parameter template." Claim 10 has also been

amended to include the recitation of "using at least one stored parameter template." Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 10 is found in the specification on page 17, lines 14-26.

Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice.

As discussed at the interview, Bandini et al does not show or suggest a method for combating spam including using at least one stored parameter template as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 10 are therefore patentable.

Applicants have amended claims 2, 4, 12-13, 15-16 and 18 to provide proper antecedent basis for all items claimed therein in light of the amendments to claims 1 and 10.

Claims 2 and 4-9 depend directly or ultimately from claim 1 and recite additional patentable matter and therefore are also allowable. Claims 11-20 depend directly from claim 10 and recite additional patentable matter and therefore are also allowable.

Applicants have carefully studied the remaining prior art of record herein and conclude that the invention as described and claimed in the present application is neither shown in nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant